

**REMARKS**

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,761.

**Drawings**

It is noted that no Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948) was received with the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant must assume that the drawings are acceptable as filed.

**Double Patenting**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) a Terminal Disclaimer for claim 1 is submitted herewith. Acknowledgment of the receipt of this document is respectfully requested.

**Claim Amendments**

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1-3 to obviate the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112.

In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claims 1-3, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

Application No. 10/673,413


**Summary**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 29, 2004

By:

  
Bruce H. Troxell  
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC  
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404  
Falls Church, Virginia 22041  
Telephone: 703 575-2711  
Telefax: 703 575-2707